

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 31-34, 36, 39-42, 44-46, 48-52, 58-59 have been amended to present the claims in better form for allowance and for possible consideration on appeal. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to accept the proposed amendments. Claims 1-30, 37-38, 47 and 54-57 have been previously cancelled. No new claims have been added. Therefore, claims 31-36, 39-46, 48-53 and 58-60 are now are presented for examination.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 1-36, 39-41, 44-46, 48-51 and 58-60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajasekharan, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,480,961 (“Rajasekharan”), in view of Xie, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,606,393 (“Xie”).

Applicants respectfully submit that Rajasekharan discloses “a method for *secure streaming of digital audio/visual content*. Secure streaming provides *protection against unauthorized use* of digital content.” (Abstract; emphasis provided). Rajasekharan further discloses that “*authorization data is received from a source... [and] the source is a server computer system accessed via a network. The server can provide the digital content as well as the authorization data.*” (col. 4, lines 6-9; emphasis provided).

Xie discloses “a *message authentication code* (“MAC”) that is attached to digital content.” (col. 1, lines 27-29; emphasis provided) Watermarking is an example of a MAC system. A watermark is “*embedded in the media stream*, so that removal of the watermark may destroy or visibly alter the underlying content.” (col. 1, lines 32-38; emphasis provided).

Claim 31, in pertinent part, recites “generating a unique validation key associated with the data stream . . . wherein the unique validation key is generated based on a

uniform resource locator (URL) and an encryption key.” (emphasis provided).

Applicants respectfully submit that Rajasekharan does not teach or reasonably suggest such a feature. Rajasekharan discloses secure streaming that provides *protection against unauthorized use* of digital content (Abstract); however, Rajasekharan fails to teach or reasonably suggest that “the unique validation key is generated based on a uniform resource locator (URL) and an encryption key” as recited by claim 31. (emphasis provided).

In addition, Xie does not teach or reasonably suggest “generating a unique validation key associated with the data stream . . . wherein the unique validation key is generated based on a uniform resource locator (URL) and an encryption key” as recited by claim 31. (emphasis provided). Xie discloses watermarking digital content (col. 1, lines 32-38), but fails to teach or reasonably suggest “generating a unique validation key associated with the data stream . . . wherein the unique validation key is generated based on a uniform resource locator (URL) and an encryption key” as recited by claim 31. (emphasis provided).

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Rajasekharan nor Xie, individually or combined, teach or reasonably suggest “generating a unique validation key associated with the data stream . . . wherein the unique validation key is generated based on a uniform resource locator (URL) and an encryption key” as recited by claim 31. (emphasis provided). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection to claim 31 and its dependent claims.

Claims 39, 44, 49 and 58 contain limitations similar to those of claims 31. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 39, 44, 49 and 58 and their dependent claims.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 42-43 and 52-53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rajasekharan, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,480,961 (“Rajasekharan”), in view of Xie, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,606,393 (“Xie”), in further view of Willis, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,738,815. (“Willis”).

With regard to claims 42-43 and 52-53, they depend from independent claims 39 and 49, respectively and thus, include the limitations of the independent claim from which they depend. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 42-43 and 52-53.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby earnestly requested.

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request for an Extension of Time

Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.


Charge our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: October 13, 2005


Aslam A. Jaffery
Reg. No. 51,841

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030
(303) 740-1980